

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
31.	C.4.1.7	Other Retrievals and Remediation	C-55	<p>“The Contractor shall retrieve CH-TRU waste packages from shafts 262-266, 235 and 302-306.”</p> <p>Please confirm that the 235 shaft is CH-TRU and not RH-TRU.</p>	<p>Shaft 235 contains the mis-identified 17th RH Canister, 16 of which have already been shipped to WIPP. The 17th Canister was not shipped because of the mis-identification as RH-TRU when it should have been categorized as, and meets the requirements for, CH-TRU. The baseline currently expects that this 17th canister will be repacked – as CH-TRU. Therefore, the Contractor will retrieve CH-TRU from shaft 235.</p> <p>The RFP, Section J, Attachment J-17, will be amended.</p>
32.	C.5.3.7	Update to General Facility Information Document	C-69	<p>“The Contractor shall prepare triennial updates to the General Facility Information(GFI) document based on the next required submittal in 2017 (by the LCBC Contractor) as required by modification submitted Jan 23, 2012.”</p> <p>The requirement for a triennial update to the GFI document and the content of the update is specified in the NMED/LANL Order on Consent from March 1, 2005. The requirement for an update is not specified in the recently approved 2016 NMED/LANL Consent Order. Does the DOE still wish to prepare the triennial update to the General Facility Information document as requested in the RFP? What is the regulatory driver for the requirement?</p>	<p>Although the 2016 Consent Order Section IV.A.7(n) still references an earlier version of the GFI document, it no longer contains the language in the 2005 Consent Order specifically requiring the GFI.</p> <p>However, a NMED letter of direction still requires this document be updated on a triennial basis to provide a compendium of the changes to the facility. DOE still wants the GFI updated on a triennial basis as described in C.5.3.7.</p>

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
33.	Section L / Att. L-8 Interfaces 5	Assumptions / Interfaces with the NNSA M&O Contractor (Item 5)	L-71	It is unclear how to price WCATS services based upon the information provided. Is it 1.5M, \$2.2M, or \$3.7M annually?	<p>WCATS requires two different assumptions for operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) \$1.5M/yr is for keeping the information in WCATS up to date and (2) \$2.2M/yr for system software maintenance, software programming changes, and server maintenance for the software system. <p>The sum of both pieces is \$3.7M/yr. The phrase “maintaining the information” was mistakenly included in (2). The RFP will be amended.</p>
34.	Section C.14	Additional Assignments (ID/IQ)	C-131	C.14 states that currently known environmental remediation activities that are not developed sufficiently to rely on current estimates or allow accurate estimating (such as General’s Tanks) fall under the scope of C.14. Since no cost estimates are to be provided for C.14 scope, please confirm that Offerors are NOT to provide cost estimate for General’s Tanks in their Volume III costs for PWS C.12.2.1.	<p>Section C.12.2.1 that includes the General’s Tanks removal activities are to be proposed by the Offerors. The third bullet in C.14 mistakenly includes reference to the General’s Tanks as not having sufficient information to develop an estimate – which is not correct.</p> <p>The RFP will be amended to delete the reference to the General’s Tanks in C.14.</p>

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
35.	Section L, Attachment L-8	Are the quantities provided in L-8 annual quantities of total quantities for the 10-year contract?	L-69	The DOE-provided assumption regarding “Waste Processing Cost and Waste Quantities, Retrieved, Processed, and Dispositioned by Government Fiscal Year (GFY)” lists five waste categories. The language presented in this assumption is not clear; do the waste quantities presented in this L-8 assumption represent waste quantity generated each GFY or for the entire duration of the contract? Do these quantities apply to both C.4 wastes and all other wastes generated (C.5 through C.12)?	The RFP will be amended to clarify the waste quantities are total quantities “over life of contract” instead of for GFY. The assumption clearly states that these waste quantities identified are only for the remediation and demolition activities. These quantities of wastes do NOT include any additional waste quantities resulting from the processing of transuranic wastes (C.4).
36.	Attachment J-10, Section C 12.2.4, and Attachment L-8	Scope Included in 10-Year Contract Period for MDA H	J-10-32	J-10, Page J-10-32, states: “Campaign P -- MDA-H Remedy, (completion of the final remedy and submittal and approval of the Corrective Measures Implementation Report shall be completed in Option Period 2.)”; however, Section C.12.2.4 scope only includes up through remedy project planning for MDA H remedy (CME, CMIP and supporting documents) submittal and not completion/construction of remedy implementation and L-8 states: “Anticipated to start with CME development at the beginning of Option Period 1 and statement of basis support late in Option Period 1 and complete in Option Period 2”. Please clarify does the scope for MDA H only go through CMIP/statement of basis and does not include construction during the contract period? Please update the RFP to clarify the inconsistency between J-10, Section C and L-8.	<p>There is a slight disconnect in Section C.12.2.4. DOE intends that the MDA-H remedy project will be executed during the potential life of this contract. The assumption in Section L-8 and the incentives listed in Section J, Attachment J-10 are correctly written.</p> <p>The RFP will be amended to correct C.12.2.4.</p>

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
37.	Attachment J-17	Above Ground CH-TRU Waste Inventory	J-17-1	Please provide units for the information in this table and explanation of the data. For example, Line 1 Sludge Drums has a volume of 90 -- is this the total volume for the sludge drums? Is it 90 cubic meters? Is the MAR for the total volume? Is the count of 317 the number of sludge drums?	The RFP will be amended to reflect the units for the volume as cubic meters (m3). The other columns are appropriately identified without change; (PE-Ci) for MAR and count is count.
38.	Section L, Attachment L-2	List of Publications	L-48	Attachment L-2 requests that Professional Development (Special/job related training) be provided as an attachment. May we also provide the list of Publications, Awards, Honors, and Professional Recognition as an attachment instead of in the body of the resume (and exclude this from page count of the resume as well)?	Offerors shall comply with the requirements as written.
39.	L.18(l)(iii), B.2, C.3, and Attachment L-6 and L-7	Program management and support functions (C.3)	Page B-2, C-10, L-36, Attachment L-6, tab C.3 and Attachment L-7, tab C.3	It appears there is an inconsistency between C.3 and B.2. Please clarify whether C.3 is to be distributed to C.12, Material Disposal Areas.	The RFP will be amended to correct this inconsistency.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
40.	C.7.1 & Attachment L-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Surface Water Monitoring Programs & Assumptions - Campaign and PWS Section Cross Walk to Contract Periods Assumptions	C-77	<p>There appears to be an inconsistency between the RFP and the Consent Order with respect to three-week campaigns for surface water sampling.</p> <p>The second paragraph of C.7.1 states: “The Contractor shall plan sampling utilizing the EIMS sample planning module (See Mind Map in Section J, Attachment J-11, GFS/I) including an examination of the current sampling plan, planning field activities to meet the three-week long campaign requirement,...”</p> <p>Attachment L-8 states that surface water is “non-campaign” with “consistent effort from year-to-year.”</p> <p>Please clarify the statement in C.7.1.</p>	<p>The three-week long groundwater sampling campaign is applicable to the Interim Facility-Wide Groundwater Monitoring Plan (IFGMP) and does not require such for surface water sampling which is storm-related collection.</p> <p>The RFP will be amended.</p>

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
41.	L-10(f)(4)	Print type	L-9	<p>Section L-10(f)(4) states “Print type used in completing forms attached to this RFP as Microsoft® (MS) Word®, Access®, or Excel® documents shall not be changed from the styles used in the attachments.” The only attachments in native files with this RFP are the cost sheets (Attachments L-6 and L-7 in MS Excel). The font used to complete this form is Times New Roman 12 pt. If the L-6 sheet Summary by PWS and GFY is printed at 100% to maintain the font in the document the resulting print output would be greater than 50 11x17 pages, with many empty pages due to the setup of the file.</p> <p>Are we correct to assume that the print to fit function from MS Excel should be used to print the files in a logical manner? If the L-6 sheet Summary by PWS and GFY is printed at 70% it results in 8 11x17 pages. The font, however, would be approximately 8 pt.—legible, but well below RFP-compliant 12 pt. Will this be considered compliant?</p>	See Q&A 12.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
42.	L.10(f)(4)	Print type	L-9	<p>When all text on a page is the same font (Times New Roman), it can be difficult for a reviewer to differentiate sections; typically, headings, charts, and graphics are in sans serif fonts for this reason. To make the proposal easier to read and review, may we use the sans serif font Arial (which is compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act) for the text section headings, tables, graphics, spreadsheets, and diagrams (typically permitted in DOE proposals)?</p> <p>Also, given that Arial 9 is approximately the same size as Times 10, may the minimum requirement for tables, graphics, spreadsheets, and diagrams be set at 9 pt Arial (bold, italics, and regular) excluding Arial Narrow? a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z in 10pt TNR a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z in 9pt Arial</p>	The instructions regarding print type in Section L.10(f)(4) are based on DOE corporate clause language for use in all solicitations.
43.	B.2 C.13.2(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Type of Contract Phase Out Activities 	B-2 C-128	<p>There appears to be a conflict between the B and C Sections of the RFP regarding location of the costs associated with Phase Out:</p> <p>CLIN 00003 indicates C-13 be included and C-13.2 references the “Phase Out Transition Plan shall be ... at least 60 days prior to the end of the 2nd Option Period.” Please clarify.</p>	<p>Section B.2(b) table reflects that the C.13 Transition scope is costed in CLIN 00003 at the end of the Base Contract Period – in case none of the option periods are exercised.</p> <p>The RFP will be amended at C.13.2(a) to state “60 days prior to the expiration of the Contract”.</p>

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
44.	C.11.2.6	Upper Sandia Canyon Aggregate Area	C-104	Question: The Final RFP states that the SIR, R1 for Upper Sandia Canyon Aggregate Area was prepared, but does not state that it was submitted or approved. The EFRR documents the redline version of the Rev. 1 submittal, but there is no evidence of an approval or second disapproval. Was SIR, R1 for Upper Sandia Canyon Aggregate Area approved? If so, please provide a digital copy for review.	The SIR for Upper Sandia Canyon Aggregate Area was submitted to NMED; however, has not been approved.
45.	C.12.2.2	MDA-C Remedy Project	C-120	Question: The Final RFP states that "As part of the remedy project, the Contractor shall operate and maintain the SVE at MDA-C and periodically report the mass removal to EM-LA and NMED." How often is considered "periodically"?	The Offeror shall define periodically as part of its technical approach. It will have the opportunity to define such during the process of negotiating an appropriate remedy for MDA-C with NMED and developing a post-closure monitoring plan.
46.	Section L, L.13	Proposal Preparation Instructions – General	L-19	L.13(d) states that the “Offeror shall only identify critical subcontractors in Volume II”; however, L.14(e)(6) asks for “other performing entities”. If the Offeror has a pre-selected subcontractor that does not meet the definition of “critical subcontractor,” can the Offeror mention them by name in Volume II without them having to meet the “critical subcontractor definition” (since they would be a performing entity)?	The correct reference for the question is L.15(e)(6). No, we only want the Offeror to identify critical subcontractors.
47.	L.11(b)	General Volume I	L-11	Question: This paragraph indicates that Volume I documents be assembled in the order as listed in L-11 instructions. If the order as listed in the instructions is followed, the SF33 will be the 11th item appearing in this volume. Is it the intent of the DOE to see the SF 33 as the 11th item, or should it appear behind the cover letter?	Paragraph (c) states the requirements for the SF-33. The reference to “assembled in the order as listed” is for those items listed in paragraph (b). The SF-33 may appear after the cover letter.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
48.	L.11(e)(2)	Subcontractors	L-12	Question: This section represents a request for information regarding subcontractors; however, the term “Offeror” appears in the sentence at L.11(e)(2), L.11(e)(2)(i), and L.11(e)(2)(ii). Should the term “Offeror” be replaced with “Subcontractor” in each of these sentences?	The RFP will be amended to revise the title at L.11(e) to “Subcontractors and Other Entities”.
49.	L, Attachment L-8 Assumptions	Interfaces with NNSA M&O contractor, Item 5	L-71	Comment: Item 5 has the statement that “Since the system will be split, there are no costs owed to the NNSA M&O Contractor.” This sentence appears to be in conflict with the costs elsewhere mentioned in this paragraph. Please clarify.	The assumption on costs for WCATS are the costs to be expended by the Contractor in the performance of its duties under the contract and are not costs to be paid to the NNSA M&O Contractor for support.
50.	C.6.4.6	Plug and Abandonment	C-77	This section identifies wells to be plugged and abandoned, and identifies specific wells and boreholes. Item 3 states that the contractor shall plug and abandon the existing wells: R-54, R-55i, R-55i and R-61. Well R-55i is duplicated. Is this an oversight or is there a well that should be closed in place of the second mention of well R-55i?	That is a typo. The RFP will be amended to correct the error.
51.	C.5.2.4	Pueblo de San Ildefonso Drinking Water Supply Wells	C-67	The second sentence of the paragraph indicates sampling to be done by several organizations including LANL. Does the reference in the sentence to “LANL” refer to the LANL M&O Contractor, currently LANS?	The sampling will be performed by the Contractor and coordinated with DOE, EM-LA, NA-LA, the NNSA M&O Contractor and Pueblo-designated personnel. The RFP will be amended to provide clarification.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
52.	J-6, 22.a	Interfaces with NNSA Managing and Operating Contractor Systems and Services: Occupational Medicine	J-6-6	<p>The subparagraph states continuation of Occupational Medicine services for approximately 60 current personnel. It is not clear if these personnel will all transfer to the Contractor from the LCBC.</p> <p>Does the “approximately 60 people” indicated represent the expected number of people covered following transition hiring from the LCBC?</p>	The “approximately 60 current personnel” are those that the current contractor has in a biological monitoring program for the EM work scope. The future number of personnel will depend upon the Offeror’s proposed technical approach.
53.	J-16	Environmental Permits, Compliance Documents, and Agreements Applicable to EM Work	J-16-6	<p>The eight entry in the table truncates in midsentence after the word “and”.</p> <p>Will the DOE provide the full title of the Agreement in Principle and add this document to the Reference Library?</p>	The RFP will be amended to expand the table cell. The only word that missing is “Monitoring”.
54.	L.11.b.1.i	Section B: (i) B.2-2 TYPE OF CONTRACT	L-11	In L.11(b)(1)(i) the title shows B.2-2, TYPE OF CONTRACT. The actual title of the RFP Section B Table B.2-2 is Contract Cost and Fee. We suggest that the title in L.11(b)(1)(i) be changed to B.2-2, Contract Cost and Fee.	The RFP will be amended to correct the error.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
55.	Section I	Additional Clauses		<p>Please add the following clauses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 52.236-2, Differing Site Conditions <p>970.5431-4, Pre Existing Conditions</p>	<p>FAR 52.236-2, Differing Site Conditions is not applicable to this contract. The prescription at FAR 36.502, states, “The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 52.236-2, Differing Site Conditions, in solicitations and contracts when a fixed-price construction contract or a fixed-price dismantling, demolition, or removal of improvements contract is contemplated and the contract amount is expected to exceed the simplified acquisition threshold. The contracting officer may insert the clause in solicitations and contracts when a fixed-price construction or a fixed-price contract for dismantling, demolition, or removal of improvements is contemplated and the contract amount is expected to be at or below the simplified acquisition threshold.”</p> <p>Regarding DEAR 970.5231-4, Preexisting Conditions, please see Q&A #9.</p>